

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-captioned application. Original Claims 1-12 have been cancelled in favor of new Claims 13-23. The object of rewriting the claims was not a change in the scope thereof, but to write the claims in more conventional U.S. claim format for this particular art. The indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2, 4 and 6-12 is noted with appreciation.

The Office Action includes an objection to the specification noting two typographical errors. The specification has been reviewed and other changes have been made as well.

The Office Action includes objection to Figure 3 noting that one of the connection lines was incomplete. The line has been changed in the concurrently filed substitute drawing. Additionally, Applicant resubmits Figures 6, 7 and 8 on photographic paper so that they will be of sufficient quality. In light of these changes, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action includes objections to Claims 6, 9 and 10 for various reasons. In light of these objections, and a thorough review of the claims, Applicant has simply cancelled the original claims and recast them as new Claims 13-23, which have been written with the Examiner's comments in mind. As to the newly pending claims, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Similarly, the Office suggested that several of the claims are so related as to constitute double patenting. Without commenting on the accuracy of the statement, the claims have been recast in a manner believed to alleviate any concern in this

regard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the double patenting indication be withdrawn.

Finally, the Office Action includes a rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Antson et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,416,933). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In characterizing the Antson et al. patent relative to the claims, the Office asserts that the titanium dioxide layer 3, which is provided to keep lateral conductivity at a low level and provide a chemical protecting layer as described at Col. 4, lines 27-36 and 44-45 of the Antson et al. patent, meets the recitations of the claimed "electric field enhancing layer." Applicant respectfully submits that as used in the present application, the Antson et al. patent does not meet this recitation. Specifically, by "electric field enhancing layer" it is clear from the original specification that the layer is enhancing insofar as it promotes electron emission. The phrase has been changed to "electric field emission enhancing layer" to carry the definition of the original terminology into the claims. With this clarification, it is believed that the Office will agree that the claims are allowable over the applied art, particularly in light of the Examiner's comments regarding allowable Claims 2, 4, 7 and 11 where this layer is identified as being formed of carbon nano tubes or nano particles.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the above-captioned application. Should any residual issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: November 30, 2005

By: 

Charles F. Wieland III
Registration No. 33,096

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

IN THE DRAWINGS:

In accordance with the Examiner's request, please find attached herewith 5 replacement sheets of drawings (Fig. 1 – Fig. 8).